

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

In response to the Advisory Action, it is noted that the drawing objection regarding to “the flat panel display controller”, “internal timer” and “a clock counter” has been withdrawn. Applicant submits a new Fig. 2 which shows the connector being coupled to the flat panel display.

Applicant has also provided a new claim 4 which is now dependent upon claim 6.

The Advisory Action alleged that the Applicant did not provide support in the specification for “most of the objections”. However, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the objections have been addressed in detail in the previous action and as such the previous action is hereby incorporated by reference. For example, specific page numbers and teachings were specified in the last response. Accordingly, if the objection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests a indication of which objections still need to be addressed.

In any event, Applicant again notes that all of the objections as to claim 1 were addressed in the previous response. If it is believed that Applicant has inadvertently failed to respond to any objection Applicant respectfully requests a showing as to which specific language has been objected to. Applicant also notes that they responded to the objection as to claim 6 by citing to specific page and line numbers and also noting other sections. Claims 7 and 9 have been canceled and as such these objections have also been addressed. Accordingly, it appears that every single objection has been addressed in Applicant’s previous response.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-13 stand rejected under §102(e) as being anticipated by Verdun et al.

The Advisory Action does not appear to have addressed Applicant’s previous response. In particular, if the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that Applicant’s position be specifically addressed if the claims are not allowed. For example, Applicant again


notes that the connector 42 and 45 and step 230 in Verdun, which has been cited as anticipating claim 1 for example, cannot be anticipatory since as Applicant previously noted, the connector 42 in Verdun is not monitored. In fact, connector 42 is not a connector that is connected to a flat panel display. Verdun does not monitor a first node of such a connector wherein the connector is for coupling to a flat panel display. In fact, the Office Action appears to admit that the Verdun reference fails to teach or suggest monitoring a first pin of a connector connected to a flat panel display and as such claim 1 cannot be anticipated by the cited reference. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-6 and 10-13 are allowable.

As to claim 4 and 8, these claims again are also believed to be allowable since the Verdun reference does not monitor flat panel display connector as required by the claims and also fails to disclose a register based approach that stores an output signal indicative of whether a flat panel connector is coupled to a flat panel display. As such, the claims are in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 7, 2004

By:   
Christopher J. Reckamp  
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.  
222 N. LaSalle Street  
Chicago, IL 60601  
(312) 609-7500  
FAX: (312) 609-5005